



- Law in 2006 written by RDs with no other stakeholders at table
- Board make-up by law was all RDs with 2 public; 2 out of 5 of the RDs appointed were also credentialed nutritionists who rejected the idea of RD –exclusivity built in to the statute. That and public opposition (1000 letters)
- In current law RDs automatically licensed with a BS and their association's credential but no such parity for BS, MS and Doctoral level nutritionists with their own professional association credentials. Dietetics and Nutrition have some overlap in critical sciences and nutrition, but also some unique course content. There are also some philosophical differences in approach.
- **Why has no agreement been reached thus far?**
 - When we started Rep McBroom outlined that any compromise to repeal needed to include credential parity, an equal pathway to licensure for other credentialed nutritionists and that it could not cause job loss. We share this position.
 - MDA over the years, in writing and verbally portrayed all nutrition practitioners who oppose the current law as “uneducated wannabes” that want to license anyone and everyone. This is completely untrue. I want you all to be clear on what we are asking for in any potential alternative to having no law:
 - 1) We want licensing for BS, MS and doctoral level --nutritionists, naturopathic physician, pharmacists, acupuncturists, nurses and others -- who meet a standard of education, exam and experience in nutrition.
 - 2) we want the way cleared for a process of negotiation that does not allow a single professional association—dietitians-- the authority to dictate how differently trained and credentialed nutrition professionals should qualify for licensure
 - 3) we want any potential law to allow the public to choose who they want to talk with about their nutrition versus making the government the arbiter of this. This is warranted because the standard, the quality, the quantity and the reliability of existing “anecdotes of *potential* harm”

which have been floating around, does not warrant the job loss and loss of access to services the current law will impose. There are less costly and less restrictive ways to address potential for harm. (disclosures, public education, thorough histories by all practitioners rather than making it illegal to take one)

- 4) Throughout 3 joint meetings, dietitians demonstrated an unwillingness to give up the assumption of ownership to regulate the entire profession in MI making it impossible to find common ground. We believe that without throwing out the current law so all stakeholders can negotiate on a level playing field, not based on serving one subset, we will stay at an impasse.
- What you see in MI is part of national effort by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics to make state regulations synonymous with its own language and credential—this is unequivocally documented in their Licensure Backgrounder here. This effort has been rejected *all* 14 times it has come up in 12 states in the last two years and we are asking you to do the same by repealing MI current law. Licensure is *not* a federal requirement and the current law will harm communities throughout the state with job loss, drastically less access to services, and more costly services. So no law would be better than one that does harm.
 - However, AND's Model Practice Act *accepts Title Protection* regulation so this should easily be one place we can all agree on any potential compromise. Dietitians would lose nothing with this regime except a monopoly.

("The WGLSC decided that terminology for the Model Practice Act must include, at minimum, the following elements: Applicant requirements based on CDR Guidelines (Appendix D), the ADA approved definition of dietetics, a defined scope of practice, and title protection)